

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the attorney constitute a waiver of further performance by him. Hill v. Cunningham, 25 Tex. 25; Larned v. City of Dubuque, 86 Ia. 166, 53 N. W. 105; Cheshire v. Des Moines City Ry. Co., 153 Ia. 88, 133 N. W. 324. But in these cases the attorney is not confined to an action on the contract, and no act of the client will deprive him of his right to recover on a quantum meruit the reasonable value of his services. Duke v. Harper, 8 Mo. App. 296. See Cosgrove v. Burton, 104 Mo. App. 698, 78 S. W. 667.

As to the right of the one who is guilty of a breach of contract to recover on a quantum meruit the value of the services already rendered, which it seems should apply as between attorney and client, see 4 Va. LAW REV. 66.

AUTOMOBILES—LIABILITY OF OWNER—NEGLIGENCE OF SON IN DRIVING.—The son of an owner of an automobile negligently ran into the plaintiff's horse while using the automobile for his own pleasure. Plaintiff brought an action against the father for damages. *Held*, the father is not liable. *Cohen v. Meadow* (Va.), 89 S. E. 876.

For discussion of principles involved, see full and excellent article by Mr. Ashley Cockrill, 2 Va. Law Rev. 189.

Corporations—Directors as Trustees—Statute of Limitations.—The directors of a bank set up the statute of limitations in defense to an action by the receiver of the bank to recover damages for losses caused by negligent mismanagement of the affairs of the corporation, resulting in the bank's insolvency. Held, upon the application of the principles of concealed fraud, and trust relationship, the statute will not bar the action by the receiver; since it was instituted within a reasonable time after his appointment. Ventress v. Wallace (Miss.), 71 South. 636. See Notes, p. 221.

COURTS—CONCURRENT JURISDICTION—PRIORITY.—A bill was filed in a state court to have a receiver appointed for an insolvent corporation, under a state statute. Before a receiver was appointed by the state court, a trustee under a mortgage given by the corporation filed a bill in a federal court of concurrent jurisdiction praying for foreclosure of the mortgage and the appointment of a receiver pending the final decree, and a receiver was accordingly appointed. Later, a receiver was appointed by the state court who petitioned the federal court to order the receiver appointed by that court to turn over the assets of the corporation to him. Held, petition dismissed. Empire Trust Co. v. Brooks, 232 Fed. 641. See Notes, p. 229.

GIFTS—GIFTS CAUSA MORTIS—DELIVERY TO AGENT.—The donor, on his death bed, placed a check in the hands of a relative of the donee, with instructions to give it to her in event of his death. *Held*, there was a valid gift causa mortis. Sharpe v. Sharpe (S. C.), 90 S. E. 34.

It is not essential to the validity of a gift causa mortis that the donor deliver the property directly to the donee. It is well settled that de-